UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,477	07/19/2001	Francois Rey	11345.033001	5625

22511   7590   12/24/2008
OSHA LIANG L.L.P.
TWO HOUSTON CENTER
909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
KAVLESKI, RYAN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2419	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 September 2008_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,13-15,30 and 31_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,13-15,30 and 31_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendments

1.   This communication is in response to Applicant's reply filed under 3 CFR 1.111

on 9/13/2008. Claims 1-11,13-15,30 and 31 were amended, claims 16-29, and 32 were

canceled, and claims 1-11,13-15,30 and 31 remain pending.

        Amendment to claims 3-5,8, and 14 in response to objection for informalities has

been considered. The amendment to the claims obviates previously raised objection, as

such this objection is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

1.   Claims 1,2,6-11,13,15,30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

obvious over the European Telecommunication Standard ("Specification for Service

Information in Digital Video Broadcasting Systems")(ETS hereafter) in view of Bennett

et al. (US 6,421,359)(Bennett herafter).

Regarding claims 1,13,30 and 31, the ETS teaches a method of transmission of digital

information in a digital communication network, the network comprising a plurality of

packet transport streams (service information is carried as data through digital video

broadcast bitstreams)[page 7 section 1][page 13 section 5.1.2] each carrying at least

one bouquet related table (bouquet association table (BAT)) containing information

relating to a commercial bouquet [page 17 section 5.2.2], transmitting at least one other

table (a BAT can be segmented into sub-tables)[page 17 section 5.2.2] comprising a list

of bouquet identity values associated with information identifying at least one transport

stream [page 18 table 4] so as to enable identification of at least one of the bouquet

related tables with the corresponding at least one transport stream [page 19 paragraph

5].

However ETS fails to disclose that in one of the plurality of transport streams

there are at least two different bouquet related tables, and identify at least two bouquet

related tables from within the at least one packet transport stream to enable a given one

of the at least two bouquet related tables to be downloaded from the at least one packet

transport stream.

Bennett discloses a multiplexer system for receiving multiple transport streams,

each stream containing its own service information tables [column 1 lines 66-67, column

2 lines 1-27], such as bouquet association tables [column 7 lines 4-9] and are

processed within the system to multiplex into a singular output transport stream that

contains a single set of service control information tables [column 5 lines 7-22]. This

would allow multiple BAT tables to be present in a single stream. Bennett further

discloses that the different transport streams, as known in the art, are associated with a

packet identifier (PID)[column 1 lines 48-55], and when multiplexing multiple transport

streams together, ensures that no PID from different streams conflict with each other

[column 5 lines 23-51], allowing for the different services combined into a single stream to be recognized.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art given the disclosure of ETS for sending service information data in a bitstream to provide a user with information to select a service within the bitstream to combine with the teachings of Bennett for the multiplexing of multiple transport streams carrying programs or services for digital video broadcasting into a singular transport stream carrying the set of service tables for programs. One would be motivated to do so to effectively compress the streams into one stream to provide additional services [refer Bennett; column 2 lines 28-32 and column 2 lines 35-46][refer Bennett; abstract].

Regarding claim 2, the ETS teaches a bouquet related table corresponds to a bouquet association table containing information regarding the services present in a commercial bouquet [page 17 section 5.2.2].

Regarding claims 6 and 15, the ETS teaches a transport stream specific table (service description table (SDT)) is transmitted in the one packet transport stream, the transport stream specific table comprising a list of bouquet identity values (a bouquet lists services which are described within the service description table)[page 10 last paragraph] associated with that particular transport stream [page 19 section 5.2.3].

Regarding claim 7, the ETS teaches a transport stream specific table corresponds to a

service description table, used to convey information regarding the services carried in

the one transport stream [page 19 section 5.2.3].

Regarding claim 8, the ETS teaches bouquet identity values are further associated with

each of the services listed in the service description table (a bouquet lists services

which are described within the service description table)[page 10 last paragraph].

Regarding claim 9, the ETS teaches transmitting in one transport stream a table (BAT)

comprising a list of bouquet identity values associated with another transport stream (a

BAT contains the identity of a transport stream)[page 19 paragraph 5].

Regarding claim 10, the ETS teaches all bouquet association tables in a network are

identified with a predetermined packet id (PID) [page 17 section 5.2.2] and table id

value (table_id) [page 16 table 4].

Regarding claim 11, the ETS teaches a bouquet association table is identified by a table

id extension value (bouquet_ID), this value corresponding to the bouquet identity value

[page 8 paragraph 16, page 16 table 4].

2.   Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over ETS

in view of Bennett in further view of Cartwright et al. ("Issues in Multiplex and Service

Management in Digital Multichannel Broadcasting")(Cartwright herafter).

Regarding claims 3 and 14, the ETS teaches a generalized table (network information

table (NIT))[page 15 section 5.2.1] is provided, this generalized table being transmitted

in each of the corresponding transport streams in the network (wherein a NIT conveys

information relating to transport streams carried within a given network)[page 15 section

5.2.1].

However the ETS fails to disclose a NIT comprising a list of bouquet identity

values associated with a plurality of the transport streams in the network.

Carwright teaches that in a broadcasting system, program specific information

and service information are sent as data in tables, one of which being a network

information table (NIT) that can comprise of an optional list detailing services for a

transport stream for a network [page 310 PSI and Si Table Summary: Network

Information Table NIT].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art given the

disclosure of the ETS for a standard in Digital Video Broadcasting systems using

service information descriptions, such as a network information table to combine and

use the optional services list within a network information table as disclosed by

Cartwright. One would be motivated to do so to provide information to a customer

regarding the network, transport stream and other related information in digital video

broadcasting [refer Cartwright; page 310 Introduction].

Regarding claim 4, the ETS teaches a method in which the generalized table

corresponds to a network information table used to convey information regarding all the

transport streams in the network (a NIT conveys information relating to transport

streams carried within a given network) [page 15 section 5.2.1].

Regarding claim 5, the ETS teaches an at least one packet transport stream

comprising a generalised table (network information table (NIT))[page 15 section 5.2.1]

associated with at least some of the transport streams of another network (an NIT can

be transmitted for and refer to other networks in addition to an actual network)[page 15

section 5.2.1].

However ETS fails to disclose a NIT comprising a list of bouquet identity values

associated with at least some of the transport streams.

Carwright teaches that in a broadcasting system, program specific information

and service information are sent as data in tables, one of which being a network

information table (NIT) that can comprise of an optional list detailing services for a

transport stream for a network [page 310 PSI and Si Table Summary: Network

Information Table NIT].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art given the disclosure of the ETS for a standard in Digital Video Broadcasting systems using service information descriptions, such as a network information table to combine and use the optional services list within a network information table as disclosed by Cartwright. One would be motivated to do so to provide information to a customer regarding the network, transport stream and other related information in digital video broadcasting [refer Cartwright; page 310 Introduction].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11,13-15,30 and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

1.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jungers et al. (US 6,438,140) describes a data structure and method for data retrieval from a segmented information stream, the stream comprising of a payload portion that includes one or more object tables that are identified by respective table ID's within the header of the stream.

1.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan C. Kavleski whose telephone number is 571-270-3619. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on 571-272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ryan Kavleski
/R. C. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Hassan Kizou/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419